2: Hudson E-4, 6 (1938) 1938 BQS Kazak BQS

KAZAK SOCIAL STRUCTURE

INTRODUCTION

IN this paper I have attempted to explain the nature of certain features of Turco-Mongol social structure by an examination of some of the processes which appear to have been active in their development. The study is based on information gathered during field work among the Kazak from July to October 1936.[1] Most of the material, unless otherwise indicated, relates to the middle of the nineteenth century, to the period immediately preceding the Russian conquest of Central Asia.

The Kazak,[2] frequently referred to in the older ethnographic literature as Kirghiz, were until very recently a nomadic stock breeding people but are now rapidly adopting a sedentary life. They inhabit the steppe country between, roughly, the Caspian Sea and the Altai Mountains and number, according to the census of 1926, 3,959,000. Traditionally they were divided into three "hordes" or ordas: the Great Orda in the east and the Little Orda in the west, with the Middle Orda between them. They speak a Turkic language which is classed by Deny[3] with Kirghiz and Bashkir as a "western dialect." The Kazak are definitely Mongoloid in physical appearance with evidence of considerable Caucasoid admixture among the southern and western groups. Basic Kazak culture, which has been summarized by Murdock[4] is closely related in nearly every aspect with that of the Kirghiz, Turcoman, Kalmyk, and Mongols. Historically the Kazak can be first dated as a distinct people in 1465[5] although the names of some of their constituent groups may be traced much farther back.[6] They were gradually conquered by the Russians during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and now form a republic of the Soviet Union.

Although the literature on the Kazak is large the details of their social organization have remained obscure. They are usually described as divided into a large number of tribes, subtribes, gentes and "branches" whose structure, function and relation to one another are not clear. In this study I have sought to define the nature of Kazak social groupings, the process of their origin and their relation to economic life, marriage and the family, class stratification, and political administration.

[1] Field work was made possible financially by a University Fellowship from the Yale Graduate School and a grant from the Institute of Human Relations of Yale University.

[2] The present official Russian form of the name, transliterated, is Kazakh. This was adopted in order to avoid confusion with Cossack, which is also Kazak in Russian. In Kazak orthography the name is Qazaq but I have used the more familiar form.

[3] Deny, *Les Langues turques*, 202.

[4] Murdock, *Our Primitive Contemporaries*, 235–62.

[5] Muhammad Haidar, *The Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, 82.

[6] Kuftin, *Kirgiz-Kazaki*, 8.

/203 cont./

221 (primarily with the well-being of the livestock), but even here
594 he finds time "to see his friends" /tamyrnichat'/, i.e., to ride from kstau to kstau (winter camp) to visit, eat a great deal, bring and listen to news.

181 The Kirghiz-Kazak are the most cultured people among the Turks wandering in Asia, and there is no doubt that a better future lies before them. Their number is increasing and they are showing themselves to be receptive to cultural advancements.

One may judge the comparative level of culture of the Kirghiz-Kazak in part by the character of their language, by the means and forms they have for expressing their thoughts, by the richness of the folk literature, and finally by the state of development of the arts.

114 Some Russian ethnologists (Patkanov, for example) relate
197 the Kirghiz-Kazak dialect to the eastern group of the Turkic language, while others (Radlov) relate it to the western group, and more precisely to a special form of it -- the Kirghiz (which
212 is spoken by all the Turks in our region). The Kirghiz /Kazak/
195 use the Arabic alphabet, which began to be spread among the
191 Turks of Central Asia in the 8th century along with Islam. Before this (from the 4th century) they had the Syrian alphabet (brought in by Christians of the Nestorian sect). The enigmatic runic writing discovered by archeologists in Eastern Siberia has also been shown to belong to the Turks and not to the ancient Slavs, Finns, Jews, or other peoples, as many thought. A variety of the Syrian alphabet is retained now only among the Mongols and Manchu, while the remaining Turks use the Arabic alphabet.

193 The Turkic language is one of the uninflected languages (having little development of grammatical relations between words). Its structure is based on the building of words, i.e., the grammatical relationship between words is expressed not by changing the original form of the word, but by adding suffixes (affixes) and insertions (infixes) to it. In this the link between the roots and these additions is so weak that all the

8:Krader & Wayne E-4 (no date) 1955 RQ2 Kazak RQ2
Kazakhstan RQ1

KN 563 C31 K 197

it happened that, the Karakalpaks were first assigned to Kazakhstan, thus because by origin and by language they are similar to the Kazakhs; later they were transferred to the Uzbek republic, because the boundary between the Uzbek and Kazakh republics had been re-established along the old line which had separated Tsarist Russia from the home of the Karakalpaks.

The relationship of the Kazakh and Kirgiz peoples offers an even more confusing example of the complex problems which the Soviets have encountered in their attempts to combine into political units various ethnic and economic groups. The Kazakh republic at one time bore the name Kirgiz, and included approximately what is at present the Kazakh and Kirgiz republics. In the 19th century, the pastoral nomads who occupied the steppe between the Caspian Sea and the Tian-Shan Mountains were divided into two groups, the nomads of the low steppe and the nomads of the mountain pastures. Early 19th century explorers called the first group the Kirgiz-Kazakh or the Kirgiz-Kaisak; the mountain nomads were known as the Kara-Kirgiz (Black Kirgiz), or alternatively, the Dikokamenny Kirgiz (Wild-Mountain Kirgiz), or Burut. In that period, persons who today would be called Kazakh, such as the native historian and ethnographer Chokan Chingisovich Valikhanov, identified themselves as Kirgiz, ignoring the distinction between Kirgiz-Kazakh and Kara-Kirgiz.

K [10]

Toward the end of the 19th century, experts in matters concerning the Central Asian Turks pointed out that the two social groupings could be distinguished from one another in a number of ways. They differed not only in habitat but also in social organization and social class structure. The Kara-Kirgiz (the modern Kirgiz) had little if any concept of a nobility differentiated from the commoners by purity of descent. Their leaders, called manap, were for the most part local persons who had risen by right of wealth, strong following, and personal qualities to positions of authority in their respective communities. There was little sign of a general organization of these manaps. The Kazakhs on the other hand had a nobility sharply differentiated by right of birth from the commoners, with a strong feeling of interrelationship, mutual support, and hierarchy within the aristocracy. The Kirgiz-Kazakhs, moreover, were divided into three hordes, whereas the Kara-Kirgiz fell outside this structure and had another horde entirely their own.

K [565]

The Soviet regime in its infancy sought to override the difference between the Kazakh-Kirgiz and the Kara-Kirgiz; linguistically there was little to distinguish between them, and the same may be said of dress, mode of living, and religion. The two groups therefore were combined into one republic.[1] The difficulties in administering as one unit peoples accustomed to different systems of social and political authority, however much else they had in common, must have persuaded the Soviet regime to abandon the early aim of forming political divisions of maximum size. Moreover, Soviet plans for the economic exploitation of the Kazakh and the Kirgiz republics were different.

[1] In general, the early Soviet attitude was against particularisms; Transcaucasia, for example, was first established as a republic, then broken up into three republics.

2

the Soviet Union. Traditionally, peoples of Central Asia were able to leave their native pastures when times were bad and claim hospitality among other more fortunate Turkic groups. Instances have been reported in the 19th and 20th centuries of groups of Kazakhs whose herds had been depleted through drought or plague doing this; some even joined Uzbek groups, on the basis of descent from a common ancestor. Such an argument would hold only for the Uzbeks, the Kirgiz, and the Karakalpaks. It is not applicable to the Tadzhiks, and certainly not to the Russians. According to a long-established cultural pattern, Kazakhs who leave herding for farming join another group, such as Sart, for example, or Karakalpak, according to the area in which they have settled.

The general consideration of shifts in ethnic identification raises the problem of the smaller peoples of Central Asia. Aside from the many millions of Kazakhs, Uzbeks, and Kirgiz, there are various small groups, none of which number more than fifty-odd thousand. These smaller groups, who together number about one quarter of a million people, have suffered the same fate of cultural levelling, absorption, and elimination of cultural differences that has taken place throughout the Soviet world from the Caucasus to the Bering Sea. The cost of administering many small peoples is too great a luxury for the USSR to afford; the Soviets have ceased to regard these peoples as independent entities, and have awarded the highest honors to those ethnologists who have justified the formation of ever larger groups of peoples.

In 1926 more than 200,000 Kazakhs lived within the 1939 boundaries of Uzbekistan, exclusive of the Karakalpak ASSR, and 86,000 Kazakhs were living in what is today Karakalpakia. The Karakalpaks are a people closely related to the Kazakhs; they are in the main Kazakhs who a few centuries ago settled down to farming. They still maintain strong ethnic ties to the Kazakhs, and linguistically are barely distinguishable from them. The Karakalpaks increased from 146,000 to 186,000 between 1926 and 1939, an increase of 27 per cent and the highest gain of all the Central Asiatic peoples during that period. Part of this gain may have been due to the decision of Kazakhs to declare themselves Karakalpaks, or the decision of the census authorities to list the Kazakhs as Karakalpaks. The latter alternative is implausible, because it would have the Soviets contributing further to a population picture of the Kazakhs which was already unfavorable. Marxist theory rejects the capitalistic Malthusian concept, and extreme population losses are embarrassing for the Communists to explain.

From 1929 to 1933 the total livestock in Kazakhstan dropped from nearly 40,000,000 to 5,000,000 head. This was a disastrous blow to the nomads. The number of sheep and goats dropped by about 90 per cent. More than two-thirds of the horses and three-quarters of the cattle died in those years; between 1930 and 1933 more than 90 per cent of the camels died. Without these animals, the nomads cannot live. The farmer can store his grain, but the nomad can store food only on the hoof. When a head of stock dies on the steppes either it is eaten or it rots. The nomad's staple is milk, which he cannot store. These losses in livestock give some idea of the starvation conditions which prevailed during 1930-1933. Hundreds of thousands of nomads must either have

Chapter 8

COMMUNICATION

121 One of the assumptions on which this study is based is that the Kazakhs of Soviet Central Asia are a potentially receptive audience for American psychological warfare. Information gained from the study would seem to support this assumption. Such information could be used to infer psychological vulnerability areas of the target population. But one can do little in the area of vulnerability content—vulnerable to what, under what conditions?—without knowledge of the communication process as it takes place within the target population. In practical terms, before determining what is to be said, the problem of how and through what channel it is to be said in order to reach the given target should be considered.

For this reason, a general discussion of communication conditions in Soviet Central Asia seems appropriate.

LINGUISTIC CONDITIONS[1]

● 197 The languages of Turkestan may be divided into three general groups: Turkic, Slavic (e.g., Russian, Ukrainian), and Iranian (e.g., Tadzhik).

Since the Kazakhs are a Turkic people, attention will be focused on this group. The major Turkic-speaking peoples are (1) the Kazakhs, Kirgiz, and Karakalpaks, (2) the Uzbeks, and (3) the Turkmen. Uzbek and Turkmen are definitely separate languages, but those of the "three K's" are so similar in their spoken form that they may be viewed as dialects of one language. The following comparisons may benefit readers more familiar with European languages: The relationship between Kazakh and Kirgiz or between Kazakh and Karakalpak is roughly similar to that between the Czech and Slovak languages, or between the Danish and Norwegian.

In geographic areas where related languages have existed side by side, transitional strips may be found where the dialect spoken by the population has been clearly influenced by the language of their neighbors. The chief difference between the speech of the Karakalpaks and that of the Kazakhs, for example, is that the former language replaces initial "t" by "d" and "k" by "g". This feature is characteristic of Turkmen,

115 [1]Much of the material on linguistic conditions is based on a discussion with Dr. N. N. Poppe of the University of Washington.

which borders the Karakalpak. Similarly, Kirgiz is differentiated from Kazakh by minor sound changes. Within Kazakhstan proper two dialects may be found which derive their respective labels from the way the word for "no" is pronounced: (1) jŏk (dzhok), in the eastern parts of the republic, and (2) zŏk (zhok), in the western and northern parts of Kazakhstan.

These are, however, minor differences. The main point is that for purposes of oral communication Kazakh, Kirgiz, and Karakalpak are so mutually intelligible as to form a single language.

In writing and printing, the Turks of Central Asia used the Arabic script until the 20th century. In the 1930's Soviet authorities introduced first the Latin and in 1939-1940 the Cyrillic alphabets, with certain necessary additions for each language. The resultant orthographies present slightly differing appearances for Kazakh and Kirgiz. This difference constitutes a handicap, even for educated readers, to those unaccustomed to reading printed matter in both languages. Nevertheless, after a little initial hesitation, a Kazakh reader will be able to make out the content of an article in an unfamiliar Kirgiz newspaper. The communicator trying to reach both Kirgiz and Kazakhs by means of a written or printed document in one of these languages should therefore be aware that he must provide some incentive to readers of the other language to expend the extra effort.

In delimiting a target group within the Kazakh SSR one should remember that Slavs (Russians and Ukrainians) constitute over half of the total population. Russian is the language of the politically dominant group; the central government in Moscow is determined to make it the lingua franca of the realm. How much bilingualism this effort has produced among the Kazakhs is not known. Communist Party authorities frequently complain about the inadequacy of Russian instruction in Kazakh SSR schools. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that the proportion of Kazakhs with knowledge of Russian has increased greatly in the last two decades. No quantitative information in this respect is available, but a few generalizations can be made. In general, more Kazakh men than women, and more young people than old, learn the Russian language. One finds proportionately more Russian-speaking Kazakhs in urban areas than in rural (and fewest among the remaining nomadic tribes), and more among those whose socialestatus makes knowledge of Russian a necessity for maintaining that status, such as political and professional leaders and workers in prestige manual occupations such as railroading.

On the other hand, the proportion of Russians in the KSSR who have a good working knowledge of the Kazakh language is probably small. Those who have such knowledge are minor officials, Party functionaries, work foremen, and others who deal with the monolingual Kazakh population in a direct supervisory capacity.

Much more would have to be said about bilingualism in a study of the other four union republics in Soviet Central Asia.[1] The fact that

[1]The Tartars of Turkestan deserve special mention in this context: They owe their important historical position as traders and mediators between the Turks and Russians to their knowledge of languages, high general educational standards (e.g., literacy), and zeal as teachers of Islam. However, it is probable that the influence of this small ethnic group (about 1% in 1926) has declined in the last quarter of a century.